

March 1, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 2855

Question: Mr. Nathan, one of the charges of the building industry is that the urban renewal field yields no profit because of the long administrative delays and the strict building codes that are imposed on builders. And they have no incentive in this field. Could you comment on this comment?

Mr. Nathan: I think the best answer is, or I guess two. The typical progress of a renewal project in New York City has been four to five years in planning, and we're trying to cut around two-thirds out of that time under our new administration. The second thing, I guess this is the best answer of all, is that it may be that somebody says that there is no incentive but every time in the renewal program in New York City, they put a piece of land up for sale, we are inundated with requests for designation as sponsors. The last one resulted in thirty-five bids on one parcel of land.

Question: Could you explain to me and to the rest of the panel exactly whether you think it is fair for a builder who has put a great deal of money into his land to lose it simply because he cannot keep up the payments? Should we provide for a new regulation?

Mr. Nathan: No, I don't. I'm not quite sure—were you speaking about something specific, Mike?

Question: Well, what I mean is many New York land owners put a great deal of money into their buildings, and then along comes a new ex post facto law, you might call it, and the government takes over their building.

Mr. Nathan: There's such a large series of assumptions in there, each one of which is at least debatable, Mike. I would only say this, that the police powers not of the city, necessarily, but of the state, have always for hundreds of years, been used to regulate housing and building. For example, the state legislature a year ago passed a law requiring furnace enclosures and peepholes and certain light requirements. This was a considerable expense on the property owners. But the state legislature, within its power, has the authority, and the responsibility, to provide for the safety of the public, and in their wisdom have done it. It makes it difficult, but I would say that, generally speaking, there has been no dearth of people investing in property in any of our cities.

Question: Mr. Nathan, it has been commented that in rebuilding the buildings are really ugly and they're not well planned for the future when the program is going to be finished. The program may be finished in a certain area in twenty years, and by that time the building is outmoded, the whole design is twenty years behind. Are you geared to put your buildings twenty years ahead into the future?

Mr. Nathan: I'd like to establish that we are in the process of insisting on the highest quality of design in everything that goes into our redevelopment efforts. I'm not going to guess what is going to happen twenty years from now. I want outstanding design today. We are putting teeth into that requirement. We are rejecting proposals for redevelopment on the basis of design, solely on the basis of design. And we are looking to bring to New York City the really high quality, pace-setting design for the urban landscape today. Twenty years from now, I don't know.

Question: I was speaking to a former New Yorker this morning who said he was very dissatisfied with the Metro North Complex. When was this designed and built and why was it permitted to be built?

Mr. Nathan: Metro North was designed by the people in the area, who hired one of the outstanding architects in the country, and that is the first criticism I have heard of it.

Mr. Granik: I'm sorry to interrupt. I know there are many questions here, but it isn't time. Thank you, Mr. Nathan for being

our guest on Youth Wants To Know. Our thanks to you, panel, for your most interesting questions, and to you, ladies and gentlemen, for being with us. Please join us again next week on Youth Wants To Know, where through the eyes of youth, we explore, we discover, we measure the important people, ideas and events of our time. And now this is Theodore Granik bidding you goodbye.

“OUR SELF-DEFEATING DUALISM”: THE CIA AND OUR POSTURE TOWARD COMMUNISM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in his column in this morning's Washington Post, Marquis Childs points out that the recently revealed intervention of the CIA in international student affairs has so badly undermined the position of any American students who may attend the World Youth Festival next September in Sofia, Bulgaria, that it has been made untenable.

The theme of that meeting, as Mr. Childs says, will undoubtedly include a picture of “perfidious American youth corrupted by the American spy agency.” The damage will be in terms not only of the Communist bloc but also in aggravating the deep-seated anti-Americanism of many from Western Europe as well. Mr. Childs says:

The fundamental error was to believe that since what should be done could not be done openly it must be done by subterfuge.

The result has been a “self-defeating dualism.” This question is not solely that of the CIA and the students only, but a larger question of the relationship of the whole educational establishment with a Federal establishment seeking to subvert its independence by such means as tying university research to the purpose of the Department of Defense, “including such unmentionables as biological warfare.”

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Childs' column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONEY IN SECRET: THE CIA FUNDS (By Marquis Childs)

Coinciding with the storm over the CIA came a significant announcement. The next World Youth Festival will be held in Sofia, Bulgaria, in September. No crystal ball is needed to predict a major theme of that rally.

Perfidious American youth corrupted by the American spy agency seeking to subvert the true spokesmen of democracy will be roundly denounced. For the deep-seated anti-American forces in Western Europe as well as the professional anti-Americanism of the Communist bloc the Youth Festival should be a walkaway.

This is a measure of the damage done by the disclosures of the relationships between the CIA and the National Student Association and a host of other liberal and moderately left organizations. Barry Goldwater's reaction was as predictable as that of the World Youth Festival. He had no objection to the subsidies as such. But the CIA was caught subsidizing socialism and he demanded to know why the Youth Republicans and Young Americans For Freedom had not got some of the money.

Predictable, too, was the outcry in the Soviet press. “All progressive America is engaged in a scandalous business with the Agency

...” one newspaper in Moscow reported. This can be translated as: The CIA has been unmasked and with it those middle-ground liberal organizations that believe they could use CIA money to oppose Communist aims.

Behind the sensational headlines in the American press there is revealed the confusing and, in a sense, self-defeating dualism of this Nation's posture in the face of the worldwide Communist movement. The CIA subsidies began in 1951 and 1952 as the McCarthyist attack was mowing down anyone and everyone to the left of center with even the slightest suspicion of pro-Communist sympathies.

The directives of the National Security Council authorizing the CIA payments were based on the belief that what had to be done to insure that the American viewpoint was expressed in youth and other world organizations could be done by secret subsidies. Certainly, Congress at the time would never have sanctioned help for the Student Association, the American Newspaper Guild or the American Friends Service Committee no matter what valid purpose they might serve overseas.

This was the fundamental error—to believe that since what should be done could not be done openly it must be done by subterfuge. The secret could never be kept in an open society. And in view of the reputation of the CIA, enhanced by such tragic blunders as the Bay of Pigs and a constant stream of propaganda out of Moscow and other Communist capitals, the disclosure when it came was bound to be disastrous.

Britain in a quiet and understated fashion with an appropriation of \$30 million a year has given encouragement to student, artistic and other groups functioning overseas through the British Council. A semi-independent body with a majority of its 30 members chosen outside of government, the Council is one of those British compromises that seems to work.

But our self-defeating dualism goes deeper, in the view of those now trying to appraise the damage, than the flaw of secrecy through an intelligence agency. Negotiating with the Soviet government to try to get a standstill agreement on antiballistic missiles has basically no relation to trying to get adequate representation for the American view at an international student rally. They are two different problems that must be met, if they are to be met at all, in different ways.

Here is the larger question. Is there any real interest, particularly in view of what appears to be growing neo-isolationism, in confronting the second problem and insuring that a free exchange with the American viewpoint fairly presented takes place? If the answer is no, the rally in Sofia will be a solo exercise for those who mean to control all such forums.

In the uproar over the CIA subsidies are echoes out of America's age of innocence. The voice of a conscience long silent could be heard. With the encroachment of big government and the vast military expenditure, a large part of the budgets of most universities is in research for the Department of Defense, including such unmentionables as biological warfare. This is so taken for granted that many educational institutions keep lobbyists in Washington to get projects. What this does to the independence of institutions of learning, with, in effect, subsidies on a far greater scale than those of the CIA, is a troubling question.

DAYTONA, FLA., NEWS-JOURNAL
ENDORSES INTERSTATE LAND
SALES FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF
1967

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President Johnson in his American consumer protection message